1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

parents, he may yet establish with him a relationship which is closer and more significant than the relationships he has with other kinsmen genealogically less distant but living in places where his affairs do not lead him. Similarly, if a man is forced by circumstances to co-operate in sheep management with a distant uncle or second cousin this transforms a genealogically distant connexion into a close and very significant kinship bond. Naturally, a man normally prefers to co-operate and have intimate friendships with close relatives, but in their absence, or where there is an exceptionally strong personal preference for an individual kinsman who is not closely connected, a distant kinsman is, as it were, 'drawn in' so that what becomes significant is the fact of relationship and not the genealogical distance separating kinsmen. This potential efficiency of any kinship relation is perhaps reflected in the way a man refers to a cousin when he is in his presence. In explaining that a man is a first cousin he will say, 'He is my first cousin', but of his second cousin he will only say 'He is my cousin'. By omitting any reference to the distance of cousinship, the effect is to draw the distant kinsman nearer to the man who is speaking. It might be said that an individual has two kindreds; the first is the 'ideal' kindred in which conflicts of obligation and responsibility to kinsmen are measured by formal kinship distance; the second is the 'effective kindred' in which the frequency and character of kinship intercourse which actually takes place, and the practical needs of a man and his family, are also important considerations.

Genealogical connexion beyond the limits of the kindred is not normally of any significance. Men who are third or fourth cousins may possibly be aware of this fact but in general it does not make them behave towards one another differently than they would if they were unrelated. But if a man possesses wealth or influence in the community so that some advantage is to be gained by claiming relationship with him, then he often finds that his 'effective kindred' extends beyond the conventional range of second cousinship and comes to include third and even fourth cousins. When Sotiri Achnoulas, who unlike most of the Sarakatsani in Zagori has more goats than sheep in his flock, was dismayed at the promulgation of a government order forbidding the pasturage of these animals in certain areas of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Zagori, he decided to pay a visit to his 'cousin' John, a Sarakatsanos of wealth and influence. He was confident that John could help him through his influence over the local Member of Parliament. 'He has him in his pocket' (τὸν ἔχει στὴ τσέπη του), he explained. John and Sotiri are third cousins. This otherwise tenuous and formally unrecognized kinship link is 'drawn in' to provide a basis of mutual trust in a relationship which is clearly one of patronage. John, for his part, does not resent the importunate requests of his distant relatives. The ability to bestow patronage is its own reward, for it increases his prestige not only in the community of Sarakatsani but with such personalities as parliamentary candidates who compete for the votes which they believe he commands.

A man's 'effective kindred' may also be considerably more restricted than the conventional limits allow. This happens when a family possesses so little prestige that kinsmen would rather not have any unnecessary association with its members. A case in point is the family of Pistiolis at Skamneli which is desperately poor and although morally upright is almost socially outcast. The genealogical information which the father was able to provide was meagre. He did not even know where most of his first cousins were living, and of second cousins he could name only a few. Over a long period of years he had received very few invitations to the weddings of kinsmen, and although he travelled considerably, earning a pittance by carrying goods on his two pack mules, he was too ashamed to ask for hospitality at a kinsman's home in the places where he knew them to be living; consequently he always slept in the open, a circumstance which encouraged mocking remarks about his shaggy and uncouth appearance.

But besides the flexibility in the range of obligations to collateral kinsmen there are also situations which may lead to their complete abrogation. Trust and mutual confidence is the basis of kin relationship. Quarrels which question these qualities are rare, but where they do occur they are far more serious than the differences which are expected to arise between unrelated men. In the latter instance normal social relations may be resumed after a long period of estrangement, but in the former case, especially where one kinsman has publicly insulted another, confidence is permanently destroyed. The proverb,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

608 generally not connected by kinship or marriage. It is therefore, despite the ritual sanction it contains, an inherently fragile bond which can only be sustained through the meticulous disciplining of attitudes and feelings on both sides. Two people formerly unrelated are drawn into a relationship of exacting ethical standards in which their mutual esteem and respect are profoundly committed.

[783] Just as the gift of God's grace which is implied in the rite of Baptism is a free gift, a gift without motive, and one which expects no reciprocity, so it is held that a godfather ought not to refuse any reasonable request of his godchild. In practice a godchild has little to do with his godfather, to whom, however, he must show a formal respect more punctilious than the respect he observes to his natural parents. While the ritual relation between the godfather and his godchild is more important than that between bridegroom and sponsor, the social relationship between the natural parent and the spiritual parent, persons of the same generation with common or complementary interests, is more important than that between the spiritual father and his godchild. Nevertheless, when a man seeks a favour from the godfather of his child, he asks for this help implicitly, or explicitly, in the name of the child; for it is understood that he has the right to make this request because of the ritual relation which exists between his child and its spiritual father. It follows that, in an important sense, the social relationship between the natural and the spiritual parent is dependent on the ritual link between godfather and godchild.

608 851 557 The wedding sponsor, in theory, has the right to baptize all the children of the marriage. The Sarakatsanos, however, seldom wastes these opportunities by allowing a single godfather to baptize all his sons. When the second son is born he tactfully asks the godfather of his first son if he would mind surrendering his right on this occasion because X has asked him if he might have that honour. He may add that as X is an important man he fears to give him offence. This, of course, is not true but the lie serves its purpose. In this way a man may establish almost as many links of spiritual kinship as he has children. If the first child is a girl, the sponsor baptizes her but normally he must also become the godfather of the first son when he is born. However, if two or three girls are born in succession, he may be

608 851

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

However, if two or three girls are born in succession, he may be asked to waive his right before the birth of the next child in case he is bringing bad luck by having an 'unlucky hand' (κακορίζικο χέρι).

A man may sometimes ask a father if he can baptize his child, and it is agreed that ideally this is the correct procedure. However, since the prospective godfather is more often a person of higher social status or prestige, it is generally the father of the child who takes the initiative in establishing the relationship. It is not easy for a person to refuse to 'baptize' a child, but a man who is forced somewhat unwillingly into the relationship does not generally become a useful or co-operative spiritual kinsman. Yet the advantages of the relationship do not all lie on the one side. A man who has 'baptized' many children has many clients who are in some measure morally bound to support him whether with votes, commercial custom, or in some other way. A man with many dependants wins prestige amongst his equals. And to stand as godfather is in itself a good thing, an action pleasing to God.

Considerably more than half the spiritual kinship relations of the Sarakatsani are with persons outside the community. The occupations of these persons are various. They include cheese merchants, animal dealers, village Presidents, members of village councils, village shopkeepers, other prominent villagers with influence, transport lorry owners, veterinary experts, lawyers, Members of Parliament, grammar school teachers, tailors, and others. They have one quality in common that they all are able in different ways to help or hinder the families who wish to establish a link of spiritual kinship with them.

Spiritual kinship is not the only means of introducing an element of moral commitment into a relationship with a person outside the community, but it is the most effective. The ritual sanction 'locks' the relationship. An accusation of ingratitude may easily break well established relations of friendship of the kind that are based on the exchange of complementary favours, but it cannot destroy a connexion of spiritual kinship, nor is it a justification for retaliation against the other partner whatever the provocation. Although there are godparents who do not alter their course of conduct after entering the relationship, this is rare. Public opinion and a man's religious and social conscience put some restraint on him. Naturally, merchants and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

S G 608 557 Naturally, merchants and others are well aware of the motives behind the naïve manœuvres of the Sarakatsani. But, as we have already said, they also gain various advantages. They do not, except in the unusual case of a very rich or powerful individual, become lavish patrons. Few of them give away anything for nothing. But they become helpful rather than hostile, they will exert their influence for their spiritual kinsmen and in doing so they themselves win prestige. A shared system of values regulates their mutual behaviour in which friendship and trust replace hostility and suspicion.

3. VILLAGE FRIENDSHIP AND PATRONAGE

G 623 666 [622] In the villages authority rests in the hands of a council of five members. From its own number it elects a President and Vice-President while the choice of the council itself is the result of local elections which are held every four years. In these,

S [641] [660] all adult villagers of both sexes, and those shepherd families who possess citizenship rights in the village, are entitled to vote.

G 665 666 623 For electoral purposes any person may form a party providing he can present to the electorate a card with the names of seven candidates. In practice village elections seldom produce more than two parties, those who support the President in power because they are his friends, and those who want a change because they are not his friends. These parties are essentially personal followings, not corporate associations, and there is not necessarily any direct alignment with the parties of national politics. The citizens vote by handing in the party card of their choice with four crosses against those of the seven candidates who are preferred. The party which polls the greater number of cards wins the election. The four candidates of the successful party who record the largest aggregates of personal votes become members of the council. The person amongst the candidates of the defeated party or parties who claims the largest number of personal votes is also elected to the council as the representative of the defeated minority's interests. The five members of the new

G [622] [624] council then proceed to elect two of their number as President and Vice-President. These men hold office for two years, at the end of which period their authority may either be confirmed for the remaining two years of the council's term of office, or they may be replaced by the election of new officers.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

might lead to relations of political friendship. A relationship which has many of the aspects of patronage exists between the dominant family and the other associated families in a co-operating 'company', but these connexions are based on the values of kinship, not friendship. When a Sarakatsanos says 'I have him as a friend', he generally means that he has established a relation of mutual advantage with a person outside the community who in most cases is in the superordinate position of patron. The use of the word 'friend' by the Sarakatsanos is not here encumbered with any theory of equality or disinterested motives. The fact that in terms of power he is the weaker partner in the majority of his relations of friendship is recognized by the Sarakatsanos but does not immediately concern his pride since these people stand outside his community. On the contrary, the more effective relationships of this kind that a man possesses, the greater his prestige in the community since it proves him to be an able protector of his family and his flocks.

It is by no means certain that a President will accept any Sarakatsanos as his political client. What the President has to offer will be clear enough from the earlier description of the ways in which he can help or hinder. The chief service the shepherd is able to pledge in return is his vote and those of his family and associated kinsmen. But to accept a man as a client commits the patron to protection instead of exploitation, and to that extent it is a restriction on the free exercise of his power. A President generally prefers to assume these obligations only to Sarakatsani with some influence. Naturally, more humble families have vicarious access to his patronage through their influential kinsmen, but the intermediate link which separates them from the President's beneficence makes it less likely that their affairs will be settled with the same despatch and satisfaction.

The extent to which a President needs to enter these commitments depends, of course, on the balance of the political groupings in his village. In one village the President commanded about three quarters of the village vote, but by his generally uncompromising hostility he had driven the Sarakatsani into the arms of the small opposition party. A month before the election it appeared that he had no Sarakatsan supporters and that his cause was lost. Conveniently the election was held in November,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

after the Sarakatsani had departed to the plains eighty miles away. The opposition party chartered a lorry to transport, as they had calculated it, an adequate number of Sarakatsan voters to assure their victory. But, in the event, the President skilfully contrived a narrow majority by making secret agreements with two shepherd families. The five members of these families who returned from the plains, ironically enough in the lorry chartered by the opposition, were sufficient to give the President victory and a new term of office.

After the election the two families received a number of favours. In the spring the sheep of one family were short-counted by sixty and the flock of the other, which by right of the customary rotation of grazing areas ought to have gone to an area of indifferent grazing, spent a more profitable summer on the village's best grassland. In the face of the unusual solidarity of the local Sarakatsan group at the time of the election, the action of the two dissident families was described as treacherous. They were branded as 'The President's men', with an overtone of meaning which implied that they were puppets dancing at the command of the master, capable even of betraying their own people. Yet as passions cooled and the months passed, evaluations changed perceptibly. At first the members of these families were unequivocally 'traitors', but later they were considered merely 'cunning' (by no means an entirely pejorative judgement), and eventually one sometimes heard grudging admissions of their 'cleverness'. For it is recognized that each family is free to seek its own protection and the political friends who can provide it. Indeed, Sarakatsani believe that in the nature of the situation favours and concessions are to be won only by some, not all families. It is, therefore, the duty of each head of family to scheme and intrigue for his own security. Only in the case of a breach of faith between kinsmen is an accusation of treachery seriously considered.

But the friendship which a Sarakatsanos achieves with a village President, or indeed with any other influential person, involves more than the exchange of specific material favours; it establishes, also, an asymmetrical relation of sociability which enhances the prestige of both men. A Sarakatsanos who has friendship with the President boldly sits down with him at the same table when he enters the coffee-shop. The President offers

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

him a drink, he stands him a drink in return. Meeting him in the village square, the shepherd stops to talk for a few minutes about this and that. Were they not patron and client, a curt 'Good day' from each side would be the extent of their social intercourse. However, it is not a relationship of equals. The shepherd belongs not only to a different community, but to a qualitatively inferior one. While the President will say of a villager who is similarly his client that this man is his friend, he will not say this of a shepherd. If an explanation in his presence is necessary, he may say, 'George is a good lad, I help him', but behind his back he will simply say, 'He is my man'. Yet, although they are his social inferiors, the President gains prestige by being seen publicly with his shepherd clients. If he drinks with other villagers who are his supporters, this is no cause for comment. He merely keeps company with those who are his social equals and natural companions. When he drinks with four or five shepherds it draws attention to his possession of power, to his ability to hold men who do not waste their time drinking with ordinary villagers whom as a class of persons they detest and despise. The Sarakatsanos accepts his position of inferiority in the relationship because he must. He does not, as most villagers would, address the President by his Christian name; but he is not subservient in his manner. He speaks to him courteously as 'President'. When another person of importance comes to speak to the President, and it is clear that he is dismissed, he moves to another table, or with a 'Good health, President', to which the latter replies, he leaves the shop. These are the conventional terms on which these unequal friendships are founded. What is important to the Sarakatsanos in these situations is that other shepherds who do not possess this valued link should see and envy him.

In asymmetrical friendship relations, since it is assumed that the patron has more favours to offer than the client can return, or that reciprocal favours are so dissimilar in quality that accountancy is difficult, there is often greater stability than in friendships between equals, which are very frequently bedevilled by accusations of ingratitude. Yet, even here, there are many complaints, the patron asserting that the client should be more vocal in his gratitude, the client complaining that the patron does very little in relation to the client's worth and needs, and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

S G 571 554 [558] [559]

If a patron cannot effectively protect his clients his prestige is diminished; and in his own community the client, too, suffers for the incapacity of his patron, since the potential of his strength from this source is seen to be less than was supposed. But when the protection is effective, both patron and client gain prestige from the relationship. The colleagues of the patron envy him the power which his control of a body of clients assures for him, other families in the client's community envy him his cleverness in winning powerful patrons. But the Sarakatsan client will not share with others the vicarious influence which patronage brings him, unless they are kinsmen or affines. For he believes that if he shares his advantage, he loses it. And this is a further reason why relationships across the boundaries of the community with persons of influence are exclusive and particular connexions established by the individual family.

G 647 S G 571

We see that while the organization of administration stretches down, as it were, from the central Government towards the village community but loses power and the ability to take decisions the farther it extends from its point of origin, the structure of the system of patronage, which is based on social relationships between clients seeking for a man with the ability and friendship connexions to protect them and a patron who accepts these duties in return for political allegiance, grows upwards and through lawyers, other persons of influence, and Members of Parliament, is linked to the legislative assembly. Thus the organization of government and the structure of patronage are parallel hierarchies. At any particular level the two hierarchies are related through ties of friendship. The shepherd or villager is excluded from the Government hierarchy, but through the structure of patronage he may be able vicariously to submit his case before a senior official in the public service.

S G 571 631 621

Patronage is the means through which the local community is linked to the wider national society. And it is significant that the group which seeks this connexion is the individual family and not the community. This is clearly the case amongst the Sarakatsani, but even villagers do not co-operate in seeking Government favour except where the interests of the whole village as such are attacked. If the President of a village is able to help a village friend by his influence in the town, he does so

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

in the role of friend or patron, not as President and leader of the village. And in personal affairs a villager or shepherd may often go directly to his patron[1] in the town. The importance of this is that the community is integrated piecemeal with the wider society along lines of personal obligation and not through membership of a large corporate group capable of attempting an infinitely stronger resistance to the authority of the State.

More generally, patronage links persons of different social status introducing into their social relations a common area of shared values which would otherwise not exist. In the context of the Zagori village it links the shepherds to the more important villagers, enabling the former to come to terms with the villagers' hostile attitude and the latter to mobilize the voting power of the shepherds in their own support. Since different shepherd families support different village personalities, it ensures that the latter continue to hold office and power even in villages where shepherds considerably outnumber villagers on the electoral roll.

Similarly, the patron-client relation between the lawyer and the villager or shepherd relates members of local village and shepherd communities to the professional classes in the small towns and larger provincial centres. It gives political power and prestige to the patron. It brings prestige to the client also but above all it means that he is never entirely helpless in the face of the impersonal indifference of Government action which threatens the precarious balance of his economy. Patronage relations produce a certain equity in the distribution of facilities and privileges and place some check on the victimizing of individuals. It achieves this by relating the universal franchise to the personal, social, and political aspirations of individuals competing for power and honour; or to put it more briefly, by relating natural rights to personal prestige.

Finally, the bond of debt and the qualified patronage of the merchant and the town shopkeeper brings the shepherd into a permanent association with some of the leaders of town

[1] In the case of a villager the 'protector' is very often a kinsman. See Ernestine Friedl, 'The Role of Kinship in the Transmission of National Culture to Rural Villages in Mainland Greece', *American Anthropologist*, 1959, vol. lxi, pp. 30–38.